

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 5, 14, 15, 21, and 22 have been amended. Claims 1-15 and 17-22 are pending, with claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22 being independent. No new matter is presented in this Amendment After Final Rejection.

### Claim Amendments and Entry of Amendment After Final Rejection

Claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22 have been amended to change "task handlers" (without a hyphen) to "task-handlers" (with a hyphen) to be consistent with "task-handlers" elsewhere in the claims.

Claim 14 has been amended to change "the priorities" to "priorities" in line 1 to eliminate the lack of antecedent basis problem identified by the Office.

Claim 15 has been amended to insert quotation marks around the names of the function keys to be consistent with claim 8 and to insert "a" in line 2 to correct a typographical error.

It is submitted that the changes to the claims do not raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search, and place the application in better form for appeal by eliminating the basis for the rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, it is submitted that entry of this Amendment After Final Rejection is proper under 37 CFR 1.116(b) and MPEP 714.12 and 714.13.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 112

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office states that there is no antecedent basis for "the priorities" in claim 14, line 1. Accordingly, claim 14 has been amended to delete "the" from this phrase to eliminate the lack of antecedent basis problem.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-15 and 17-22 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Nelson et al. (Nelson) (U.S. Patent No. 7,170,422). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22

Independent claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22 all recite changing priorities of task-handlers in a hybrid device. However, the terms "priority", "priorities," "task", "task-handler(s)", "task handler(s)", and "hybrid" do not appear in Nelson, and the only appearance of any form of the word "handle" is in the phrase "One way to handle" in column 7, line 55, of Nelson. Furthermore, the Office has not identified the elements in Nelson that it considers to correspond to the "priorities", the "task-handlers", and the "hybrid device" recited in claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22 and claims 2-4, 6-13, 15, and 17-20 depending directly or indirectly from claims 1, 5, and 14.

It is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest the following features of independent claim 1:

1. A user interface method of a hybrid device having an input unit and a plurality of task-handlers controlled by the operation of a function key of the input unit, the user interface method comprising:
  - receiving information to change priorities of the task-handlers, using the hybrid device;
  - changing the priorities of the task-handlers in the hybrid device, based on the received information; and
  - storing information regarding the changed priorities in the hybrid device, according to a predetermined application type,wherein the priorities of the task-handlers of the hybrid device relate to an order in which the task-handlers are individually and selectively controlled, by the operation of the function key.

Nelson discloses a programmable universal remote control that can be programmed to control various devices such as a TV, a DVD player, and lights as shown in FIG. 4 of Nelson.

However, it is submitted that none of the programmable universal remote control, the TV, the DVD player, and the lights are a "hybrid device" as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the Office has not explained which element in Nelson it considers to correspond to the "hybrid device" in claim 1, or why it considers that element to correspond to the "hybrid device" in claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest a "hybrid device" as recited in claim 1.

FIG. 8 of Nelson shows command sequences in boxes 228A-228F that correspond to user-defined states 226A-226F such as "POWER OFF", "WATCH TV, etc., that are defined by a user using Nelson's programmable universal remote control and stored in the programmable universal remote control for later use. Each of the command sequences can be accessed from the box 240 in the active display 24 in FIG. 10 of Nelson, and can optionally be converted to a button on the screen of the active display or assigned to one of the function keys 28 in FIG. 1 of Nelson as described in column 12, lines 33-38, of Nelson.

The Office apparently considers Nelson's command sequence, or the button on the screen to which it is assigned, or the function key 28 to which it is assigned, to correspond to the "function key" recited in claim 1, and apparently considers the commands in the command sequence, such as the commands "TV ON", "DVD OFF", "LIGHTS DIM", "TV CHANNEL 002", "TV FORMAT STANDARD 16:9", and "TV INPUT 2" in the command sequence 228C identified by "FOX" in FIG. 8 of Nelson and shown in box 240 in FIG. 10 of Nelson to correspond to "a plurality of task-handlers controlled by the operation of a function key" as recited in claim 1.

However it is submitted that the commands in Nelson's command sequence are not "task-handlers" as recited in claim 1, but are commands that, for the purposes of this discussion, may be considered to be processed by task-handlers in Nelson's devices, i.e., the TV, the DVD player, and the lights shown in FIG. 4 of Nelson, although Nelson does not actually disclose that these devices have such task-handlers. For example, the command "TV ON" in the command sequence 228C in FIG. 8 of Nelson may be considered to be processed by a "TV ON" task-handler in the TV in FIG. 4, the command "DVD PLAYER OFF" in the command sequence 228C may be considered to be processed by a "DVD PLAYER OFF" task-handler in the DVD player in FIG. 4, etc. Accordingly, it is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest "a plurality of task-handlers controlled by the operation of a function key" as recited in claim 1.

Since Nelson's programmable universal remote control enables the user to specify the order in which the commands are listed in the command sequences 228A-228F in FIG. 8 of Nelson, the Office apparently considers this to correspond to "changing the priorities of the task-handlers in the hybrid device, based on the received information" recited in claim 1. However, as discussed above, any task-handlers that may be present in Nelson's system would be in the devices that are controlled by the programmable universal remote control using the commands in the command sequences, such as the TV, the DVD player, and the lights in FIG. 4 of Nelson, none of which is a "hybrid device" as recited in claim 1, rather than in the programmable universal remote control itself, which is also not a "hybrid device" as recited in claim 1. Nelson's programmable universal remote control cannot change the priorities of any task-handlers that may be present in the devices in FIG. 4 that are controlled by programmable universal remote control. Accordingly, it is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest "changing the priorities of the task-handlers in the hybrid device, based on the received information" as recited in claim 1.

Since Nelson's programmable universal remote control apparently stores the command sequences with the commands in the order selected by the user in the onboard computer memory 112 in FIG. 3 of Nelson, the Office apparently considers this to correspond to "storing information regarding the changed priorities in the hybrid device, according to a predetermined application type" as recited in claim 1. However, as discussed above, the Nelson's programmable universal remote control is not a "hybrid device" as recited in claim 1, and cannot change the priorities of any task-handlers that may be present in the devices in FIG. 4 of Nelson that are controlled by programmable universal remote control, none of which is a "hybrid device" as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest "storing information regarding the changed priorities in the hybrid device, according to a predetermined application type" as recited in claim 1.

Independent claims 5, 14, 21, and 22 recite features that are similar to the features of claim 1 discussed above, and it is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest these features of claims 5, 14, 21, and 22 for at least the same reasons discussed above that Nelson does not disclose or suggest the similar features of claim 1.

Claim 6

It is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest the following features of dependent claim 6:

wherein, in response to a request to change the priorities, the display unit displays a menu to select the function key from a plurality of function keys, a menu to change priorities for the selected function key, a priority change result, and a menu to select the application type.

The Office states that FIG. 10 and column 4, lines 1-47, of Nelson disclose these features of claim 6. However, it is not seen where these portions of Nelson disclose or suggest the three menus and the priority change result recited in claim 6, and the Office has not identified the elements in these portions of Nelson that it considers to correspond to these elements of claim 6, such that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to these features of claim 6.

Conclusion—Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-15 and 17-22 (i.e., claims 1, 5, 6, 14, 21, and 22 discussed above and claims 2-4, 7-13, 15, and 17-20 depending directly or indirectly from claims 1, 5, 6, and 14) under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Nelson be withdrawn.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Office is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 25, 2010

By: /Randall S. Svihla/  
Randall S. Svihla  
Registration No. 56,273

NSIP Law  
1156 15th Street NW, Suite 603  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: (202) 429-0020  
Fax: (202) 315-3758  
CYP/RSS